IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY

And

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

WRIT PETITION No.13283 of 2000

Between:

Bharateeya Gruha Vikas Samkhsema Seva Sangam,

Rep. by its Secretary, Sri P. Venkateswara Rao,

S/o. Ramachandra Rao(Late), D.No.30-11-13,

Daba Gardens, Visakhapatnam.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Union of India, Rep. by it's Secretary,

Minister of Food and Consumer Affairs
New Delhi.

2 The District Consumer Forum,
Visakhapatnam.

3 T.Venkat Rao, S/o. T.Narsinga Rao,
D.No.31-16-12, Venkateswarametta, Allipuram,
Visakhapatnam-4.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an order or direction, more in the nature of Writ Mandamus, declaring Section 27 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, as arbitrary, unreasonable and violative of Articles 14 & 19(1) (g) of the Constitution of India, and consequently quash the proceedings in P.P.No.102/2000 in C.D.No.531/98 on the file of the District Consumer Forum, Vishakapatnam as void abinitio, null and void and nonest in the eye of Law.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.V. RAGHU

Counsel for Respondent No.1: MR.A. RAJASHEKAR REDDY (SC FOR CG)

Counsel for Respondent No.2: G.P. for Civil Supplies.

Counsel for Respondent No.3: None appeared.

The Court made the following :

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

ORDER: (Per Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Sudershan Reddy)

The subject matter that arises for consideration in this Writ Petition is squarely covered by the decision rendered by a Full Bench of this Court in ***C.V. Ratnam***

v. Union of India & Others.

Following the decision of the Full Bench, this writ petition is required to be dismissed and the same shall accordingly stand dismissed without any order as to costs.

However, the petitioner shall have the advantage of the observations made in the judgment and the remedy to prefer appeal against the decision of the District Forum is left open.

_____

B. SUDERSHAN REDDY, J

Date:01-11-2004.

_____

K.C. BHANU, J

PV

To

1 The Secretary, Union of India,

Ministry of Food & Consumer Affairs, New Delhi.

2. The President, District Consumer Forum, Visakhapatnam.

3. Two C.Cs. to G.P. for Civil Supplies, High Court of A.P., Hyderabad.

4. Two C.D. copies.